



UTTERANCE OF THE KALIMAH IS NOT A PREVENTION OF THE TAKFEER

By Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab



Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab – rahimahullah – said in a letter which he sent to Abdullah ibn Saheem:

والكلمة الثانية قوله : أنَّ المشرك لا يقول : ” لا إله إلا الله ” فإيا عجباً من رجل يدعى العلم وجاء من الشام يحمل كتباً فلمّا تكلم إذا أنّه لا يعرف الإسلام من الكفر ولا يعرف الفرق بين أبي بكر الصديق ومسيلمة الكذاب

“The second word is his saying: That the mushrik does not say ‘La ilaha illa Allah’. So how strange is it not from a man who claims to have knowledge and he came from Sham lifting books, but when he spoke then he didn’t distinguish Islam from kufr, and he didn’t know the difference between Abu Bakr As-Siddiq and Musaylamah Al-Kadhab.

أمّا علم أنّ مسيلمة يشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأنّ محمداً رسول الله ويصلي ويصوم ؟. أمّا علم أنّ غلاة الرافضة الذين حرقهم عليّ يقولونها وكذلك الذين يقذفون ” عائشة ” ويكذبون القرآن ، وكذلك الذين يزعمون أنّ جبريل غلط وغير هؤلاء ممن أجمع أهل العلم على كفرهم ، منهم من ينتسب إلى الإسلام ومنهم من لا ينتسب إليه كاليهود وكلّهم يقولون : ” لا إله إلا الله ” ، وهذا أبين – عند من له أقلّ معرفة بالإسلام – من أن يحتاج إلى تبيان .. وإذا كان المشركون لا يقولونها فما معنى باب ” حكم المرتد ” الذي ذكر الفقهاء من كلّ مذهب ؟ هل الذين ذكرهم الفقهاء وجعلوهم مرتدين لا يقولونها هذا الذي ذكر أهل العلم أنّه أكفر من اليهود والنصارى ،

Didn’t he know that Musaylamah bore witness to La ilaha illa Allah and Muhammadun RasulAllah and he prayed and fasted? Did he not know that the extreme rafidah that Ali burned alive say it (La ilaha illa Allah) and so do the ones who insult Aisha and reject the Qur’an? And likewise those who claim that Jibril made a mistake and others among them whom the scholars have agreed regarding their kufr – among them are those who ascribe themselves to Islam and among them are those who do not ascribe themselves to it, like the Jews – and all of them say La ilaha illa Allah. This is so clear – for the one who has the smallest knowledge about Islam – that it has no need to be clarified. And if the mushrikun did not say it, then what is the meaning of the chapter “hukm al-murtad” (the judgment of the apostate) which the fuqaha from every madhhab have mentioned? Did those whom the fuqahaa’ mentioned and made them murtaddeen not say it – this person (the murtad) whom the people of knowledge says is worse in kufr than the Jews and the Christians?

وقال بعضهم : من شك في كفر أتباعه فهو كافرٌ وذكرهم في الإقناع في باب حكم المرتد وإمامهم ابن عربي أيظنهم لا يقولون لا إله إلا الله ؟ لكن هو آت من الشام وهم يعبدون ابن عربي جاعلين على قبره صنماً يعبدونه ولسنُ أعني أهل الشام كلّه حاشاً وكلاً بل لا تزال طائفة على الحق وإن قلت واغتربت .. لكن العجب العجاب استدلاله أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم دعا الناس إلى قول [لا إله إلا الله] ولم يطالبهم بمعناها وكذلك أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فتحوا بلاد الأعاجم وقنعوا منهم بلفظها إلى آخر كلامه فهل يقول هذا من يتصور ما يقول ؟

And some of them said: Whoever doubts regarding the kufr of their followers then he himself is a Kafir. And he mentioned them in Al-Iqnaa' in the chapter 'Hukm al-murtad' and their Imam Ibn Arabi – does he think that they do not say La ilaha illa Allah? But he came from Sham and they worship Ibn Arabi (over there) and they have made a statue on his grave which they worship. And I do not mean all of the people of Sham, may Allah forbid. There is always a group upon truth, even if they are few and estranged. And the most strange is him taking as evidence that the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu alayhi wa sallam) invited the people to say La ilaha illa Allah, but he did not demand its meaning from them, and likewise the companions of the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu alayhi wa sallam) conquered the countries of the foreigners and convinced them to say it – until the end of his words. Does anyone – who knows what they are saying – say this?

فنقول : (أولاً) هو الذي نقض كلامه وكذبه بقوله : دعاهم إلى ترك عبادة الأوثان ” فإذا كان لم يقنع منهم إلا بترك عبادة الأوثان تبين أن النطق بها لا ينفع إلا بالعمل بمقتضاها وهو ” ترك الشرك ” وهذا هو المطلوب وهو الذي نقول وهو الذي أكثرتم النكير فيه

So we say: (First of all) he is the one who contradicted his own words and rejected them with his saying 'he invited them to leave the worship of the idols'. So if he did not convince them to nothing but leaving the worship of the idols then it becomes clear that pronouncing it (La ilaha illa Allah) does not benefit except by acting upon its necessities which is leaving shirk. This is what is wanted, this is what we are saying and this is what you deny so much.

وأما دعواه أن الصحابة لم يطلبوا من الأعاجم إلا مجرد هذه الكلمة ولم يعرفوها بمعناها فهذا قول من لا يفرق

بين دين المرسلين ودين المنافقين الذين هم في الدرك الأسفل من النار فإن المؤمنين يقولونها والمنافقون يقولونها لكن المؤمنين يقولونها مع معرفة قلوبهم بمعناها وعمل جوارحهم بمقتضاها والمنافقين يقولونها من غير فهم لمعناها ولا عمل بمقتضاها فمن أعظم المصائب وأكبر الجهل من لا يعرف الفرق بين الصحابة والمنافقين لكن هذا لا يعرف النفاق ولا يظنّه في أهل زماننا بل يظنّه في زمن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأصحابه وأما زمانه فصالح بعد ذلك.

Regarding his claim that the Sahaabah did not claim anything from the foreigners except that they should say this word and that they did not know its meaning, then these are the words of a person who do not distinguish between the religion of the messengers and the religion of the munafiqeen who are in the lowest pit of the fire. Verily the believers say it and the munafiqeen say it, but the believers say it with the knowledge of their hearts regarding its meaning and along with their limbs acting upon its necessities. The munafiqeen say it without understanding its meaning and without acting upon its necessities. So among the biggest of catastrophes and the greatest of ignorance is the one who do not know the difference between the Sahaabah and the munafiqeen. This person does not know what nifaaq is and he does not think that it exists in our time, rather he thinks that it was in the time of the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu alayhi wa sallam) and his companions, but regarding his own time then it became good after that.

وإذا كان زمانه وبلدانه يتنزهون عن البدع ومخرجها من خراسان فكيف بالشرك والنفاق؟؟ ويا ويح هذا القائل ما أجرأه على الله وما أجهله بقدر الصحابة وعلمهم حيث ظنّ أنهم لا يعلمون الناس [لا إله إلا الله] أما علم الجاهل أنهم يستدلّون بها على مسائل الفقه فضلاً عن مسائل الشرك . ففي الصحيحين أنّ عمر رضي الله عنه لما أشكل قتال مانعي الزكاة لأجل قوله صلى الله عليه وسلم (أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا لا إله إلا الله فإذا قالوها عصموا منّي دماءهم وأموالهم إلا بحقّها) قال أبو بكر: (فإنّ الزكاة من حقّها) فإذا كان منع الزكاة من منع حقّ ” لا إله إلا الله ” فكيف بعبادة القبور والذبح للجنّ ودعاء الأولياء وغيرهم مما هو دين المشركين

If his time and country used to look down upon bid'ah and would kick it out of Khurasan, then how should it be with shirk and nifaaq? And woe to the one who says this, because how daring is it not towards Allah and how ignorant regarding the value of the Sahaabah and their knowledge, when he thought that they did not teach the people La ilaha illa Allah. Did the ignorant not know that they would use it as evidence in the issues of Fiqh not to mention the issues of shirk. It is narrated in the two Sahih that

‘Umar (radiyAllahu ‘anhu) when fighting those who refused to pay zakat became ambiguous for him – due to the saying of the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wa sallam): ‘I have been ordered to fight the people until they say La ilaha illa Allah. So if they say it then they have saved their blood and wealth from me, except by its right.’ – Abu Bakr said: ‘Verily zakat is from its right’. So if refusing to pay zakat is from refusing the right of La ilaha Ila Allah, then how about worshipping the graves, slaughtering for a jinn or invoking the righteous and others than them, that from which is the religion of the Mushrikeen?”

[Ar-Rasaail Ash-Shakhsiyyah, pp. 83-85]

t.me/Tawhidullaah

fb.com/TheTrueTawheed

The True Tawheed Media